

Appl. No. 10/766,158  
Amdt. Dated May. 29,2005  
Reply to Office Action of Apr. 15, 2005

### **REMARKS**

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indications of the allowabilities of claims 6-9, 11 and 12. The newly added claims 17-19 in the first response to the Action mailed on March 10, 2005 have not been commented by Examiner in the present office action.

#### ***Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102***

**Claims 1-4, 10, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Landman (3,701,071).**

#### **In regard to claims 1-4:**

Applicants have amended the independent claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claims 2 and 6 which includes the allowable subject matters as stated by the Examiner. Applicants believe it is now patentable over cited prior arts.

Claim 2 is cancelled.

Claim 3 is dependent from amended claim 1 and further discloses the board hold down having a locating portion extending upwardly from the body portion, and the daughter card defining an engaging hole engaged with the locating portion of the board hold down. Claim 3 should be allowable since it is dependent from patentable claim 1.

Claim 4 is dependent from claim 3 and further recites the locating portion having a lead-in formed on a top end thereof for guiding the insertion of the locating portion into the engaging hole of the mother board. Claim 4 should be allowable since it is dependent from patentable claim 1.

Appl. No. 10/766,158  
Amdt. Dated May. 29, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of Apr. 15, 2005

**In regard to claim 10:**

Applicants have amended the independent claim 10 to incorporate the subject matters of the allowable claim 11. Applicants believe that the independent claim 10 is now patentable over cited prior arts.

**In regard to claim 13:**

Applicants have amended the independent claim 13 to incorporate the subject matters of claim 14, which are similar to what is disclosed in the allowable claim 6. Applicant assumes that the reason why in the final office action the Examiner rejected claim 14 was that the Examiner still reviewed the original claim 14 rather than the amended claim 14 which contained the allowable subject matters as claim 6. Applicants believe that the independent claim 13 is now patentable over cited prior art Landman.

***Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103***

**Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated over Landman in view of Shipe et al. (6,773,268).**

Claim 5 is dependent from the amended claim 1 which includes the allowable subject matters stated by Examiner. Therefore, claim 5 is patentable over Landman in view of Shipe et al.

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Korsunsky et al.

By:   
Wei Te Chung

Appl. No. 10/766,158  
Amdt. Dated May. 29, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of Apr. 15, 2005

Registration No.: 43,325  
Foxconn International, Inc.  
P. O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive,  
Santa Clara, CA 95050  
Tel No.: (408) 919-6137